

REMARKS

1. Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as allegedly not showing the feature in claim 18 relating to the “prism parts in the manner of fresnel screens”. However, the Fresnel screen type prism regions of claim 18 are indeed shown in Figure 4, reference numeral 35, and described in the present specification beginning in the last paragraph on page 13. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

2. Claim Objections

The Examiner has raised several objections to the claims based upon informalities. The claims have been amended in a manner believed to obviate each and every one of the objections, so withdrawal of the objections is requested.

3. Rejections of The Claims Over The Prior Art

Claims 1, 4-9 and 13-18 have been rejected as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) over Palazzo (U.S. Patent 6,402,344); claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 over Palazzo and “common knowledge”; claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 over Palazzo and Ott (U.S. Patent 6,862,137); and claim 19 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 Palazzo and Bansbach et al. (U.S. Patent 4,669,034). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are requested.

With respect to the anticipation rejection over Palazzo, the Examiner urges that Palazzo anticipates claims 1, 4-9 and 13-18. The Examiner basically asserts that US patent 6,402,344 to Palazzo discloses a comparable room lighting system so that the subject matter of claims 1, 4 to 9 and 13 to 18 is, according to his opinion, not new.

However, this view of the Examiner is in fact not justified since Palazzo teaches a completely different system, namely a projection system having two “effects discs” 180, 181, to obtain specific image patterns, as for instance clouds, rain, snow, fire or the like (see for example column 3, lines 15 to 25, or column 5, paragraphs 1 and 2 (i.e. lines 1 to 18) of Palazzo).

Accordingly, the Palazzo projection system concerns the imaging of picture elements through simple flat discs, and Palazzo fails to teach the provision of aligned refractive prism elements, as in the present invention. Furthermore, the effects discs 180 and 181 of Palazzo are mounted in a central region for rotating movement, and only the outer or peripheral region of the discs is passed by the light. This may be understood, for instance, from fig. 3 of Palazzo, as well as from column 4, lines 1 to 3, 14 to 17 and lines 34 to 39. In this connection, it should also be noted that claim 1 of Palazzo defines that “only a portion of each effects discs and only a portion of each continuous image pattern therewithin are positioned in the path of a beam of light” (column 5, lines 51 to 53). Therefore, the light beam of the system of Palazzo is offset, that is extent eccentrically, to obtain the wished function of imaging of image patterns, contrary to the present invention.

Furthermore, contrary to the prior art, the present invention concerns a room lighting system is intended to divert the light beam, and to direct it to specific room regions. Compare for instance page 2 bottom to page 3, end of the first paragraph, or line 22 in fig. 2, or the text at the top of page 11 in the present application. Such a light beam refraction, as an essential feature of the present invention, is not provided for by the projection system of Palazzo, and this refraction would not even be possible in the Palazzo system. Therefore, the present invention as defined by the claims is new, and non-obvious. The Examiner's opinion is simply based on an inadmissible hindsight view, and should be withdrawn.

With regard to the obviousness rejections, none of the secondary references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest the elements missing by Palazzo. Indeed, discussions of those references in the Office Action do not in any indicate that the Examiner believes that any of the secondary references describe aligned refractive prism elements as in the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that no combination of the cited references renders the present invention obvious, so reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims define novel and non-obvious subject matter as compared to any of the Examiner.

Application No. 10/565,896
Amendment dated October 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2006

Docket No.: 4518-0114PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Leonard R. Svensson/
Leonard R. Svensson
Registration No.: 30,330
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
650 Town Center Drive
Suite 620
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7127
(714) 708-8555
Attorney for Applicant